



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,031	08/18/2003	Raymond Robert Patch	MSFT-1956/303857.1	3222
41505 7590 10/17/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,031

Applicant(s)

PATCH ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory J. Vaughn

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Application Background

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 7/24/2007.
2. Applicant has amended claims 21 and 22.
3. Claims 1-28 are pending in the case, claims 1, 10, 18, 21 and 26 are independent claims.
4. The examiner's rejection of claims 21-25, made under 35 USC 101, as recited in the previous office action (dated 4/30/2007) are withdrawn in view of the claim amendments.
5. The examiner's rejection of claims 1, 10, 13, 18, 21 and 24, made under 35 USC 112, as recited in the previous office action (dated 9/8/2006) are withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."

7. Claims 1-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elmore et al., US Patent Publication 2006/0059107, filed 3/30/2001, published 3/16/2006 (hereinafter Elmore).

8. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Elmore discloses validating markup language text. Elmore discloses his invention as an e-business online commerce solution (see paragraph 4), where the online solution is provided using markup language (see paragraphs 38, 39, 66, 69, 103, 104 106 etc. for examples of how the invention is implemented using HTML and XML). Elmore discloses validating the markup text. Elmore recites: *"The interconnect service EJB provides an interface that the activity smart components use to access external systems 110. Messages that contain information for external systems 110 are sent from the eBusiness support system through a particular type of communications messaging interface (CMI) 105. Examples of these CMI types include credit card validation, address validation, and service reservation, etc"* (paragraph 65).

Elmore discloses the use of validation delegates. Elmore recites: *"Integration Layer 102, through which Smart Components 104 access external systems 110. The interconnect service within this layer uses communications messaging interfaces (CMI) 105 and adapters 106/107 to transport messages. The CMIs are pre-defined interfaces to common services (e.g. rating, address validation, service reservation, etc.) needed to complete client requests for customer, pre-order, order, and post order transactions. The EAI Adapters 106 provide the flexibility to integrate with an EAI package 109. These adapters are configurable software interfaces for different EAI packages, such as Vitria BusinessWare or BEA eLink. Other adapters are also available"* (paragraph 37).

Elmore discloses validation tables in the form of libraries. Elmore recites: *"JavaScript Libraries. The JavaScript libraries are used for client-side validation. js_validation.js provides JavaScript methods for validating data to submit to the server. For example, it is used to verify that the required fields are filled in by the user. Client-side validation should be used in conjunction with server-side validation. The former is not a replacement for the later. Although client-side validation may enable a better user experience by performing validation on the fly, it exposes the application to security risks from users who could bypass the JavaScript and submit erroneous data to the database. The JavaScript libraries are also used for input and form submit manipulation. js_common.js provides javaScript methods for setting request*

parameters and passing variables and values to the server" (paragraphs 125-127).

Elmore discloses validating text by using validation delegates and validation tables, as described above. Elmore discloses a plurality of elements, related to each other in a tree representation, where there exist roots and subtrees of elements in figure 12.

9. **Regarding dependent claims 2, 3, 6 and 9**, Elmore discloses determining if a validation table contains no validation delegates (claim 2), identifying and executing a third validation delegate (claim 3), making a validation decision (claim 6) and validating text (claim 9). Elmore discloses Business Rule Adapters in Figure 1 at reference sign 107. Business rule adapters specify the determining, identifying, decision-making and validating required for the specific business problem being solved.
10. **Regarding dependent claims 4 and 7**, Elmore disclose the use of flags to implement the business logic of the ecommerce interface – see paragraphs 72, 87 and 89 for some examples).
11. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Elmore discloses a plurality of validation tables, as described above (described as a plurality of libraries).
12. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Elmore discloses the delegates as interpretable code – see the code listing after paragraph 64.

13. **Regarding claims 10-28**, the claims are directed toward a method, system and computer readable media for the computer-readable medium of claims 1-9, and are rejected using the same rationale. Claim 26 is further directed toward *"where the mapping information can be modified to cause the same validation engine, without modification, to modify which executable validation delegates the validation engine selects for which corresponding element type"*. Elmore discloses a connection with external systems that allow the mapping information to be modified to cause the same validation engine, without modification, to modify the validation delegates. Elmore recites: *"The interconnect service EJB provides an interface that the activity smart components use to access external systems 110. Messages that contain information for external systems 110 are sent from the eBusiness support system through a particular type of communications messaging interface (CMI) 105. Examples of these CMI types include credit card validation, address validation, and service reservation, etc"* (paragraph 65).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
15. **Regarding independent claim 1**, applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose the claimed validation (page 10 to page 12, of the response filed 7/24/2007). Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1, as described above. Claim requires: "*validation tables not being schema*" and "*at least one non-syntactic condition*". The examiner has provided definitions from Wikipedia for schema, semantics and syntax in support of the following rebuttal. Elmore clearly shows validation in the form of lookup tables that are outside of schema. These lookup tables provide validation beyond the validation normally associated with the markup language embodiment of the claimed invention. The syntax rules for markup language varies (HTML is less restrictive, while XML is more restrictive), however a valid markup language document may still be invalid (applicant's originally filed specification at paragraph 40 provides an example in the form of a street address). Elmore discloses this kind of validation. See paragraphs 37 and 65, where Elmore discloses validation of street address.
16. **Regarding independent claim 26**, applicant indicates that Elmore fails to disclose modifying mapping information. Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 26 as described above.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory J. Vaughn
Patent Examiner
October 3, 2007



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER